

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

RENATA DeALEAN DILLARD,

Plaintiff,

VS.

No. 13-2253-JDT-dkv

BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.; THE BANK  
OF NEW YORK MELLON TRUST, N.A.,  
F/K/A THE BANK OF NEW YORK;  
HSBC BANK USA, N.A.; MORTGAGE  
ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION  
SYSTEMS, INC.; RUBIN LUBLIN  
TN, PLLC.,

Defendants.

---

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISMISSAL  
AND  
ORDER CERTIFYING APPEAL NOT TAKEN IN GOOD FAITH

---

On August 1, 2013, Magistrate Judge Diane K. Vescovo issued a report and recommendation that the motions to dismiss filed by Defendants in this matter [DE#s 5, 10, 16] be granted and that the *pro se* complaint be dismissed as barred by the doctrine of res judicata. No objection has been filed. Consequently, the report and recommendation for dismissal of this matter [DE# 21] is ADOPTED, and the case is hereby DISMISSED.

The court must also consider whether Plaintiff should be allowed to appeal this decision *in forma pauperis*, should she seek to do so. Pursuant to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, a non-prisoner desiring to proceed on appeal *in forma pauperis* must

obtain pauper status under Fed. R. App. P. 24(a). See Callihan v. Schneider, 178 F.3d 800, 803-04 (6th Cir. 1999). Rule 24(a) provides that if a party seeks pauper status on appeal, she must first file a motion in the district court, along with a supporting affidavit. Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(1). However, Rule 24(a) also provides that if the district court certifies that an appeal would not be taken in good faith, or otherwise denies leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*, the party must file her motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the Court of Appeals. Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(4)-(5).

The good faith standard is an objective one. Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962). The test for whether an appeal is taken in good faith is whether the litigant seeks appellate review of any issue that is not frivolous. Id. It would be inconsistent for a district court to determine that a complaint should be dismissed for failure to state a claim based on the doctrine of res judicata but has sufficient merit to support an appeal *in forma pauperis*. See Williams v. Kullman, 722 F.2d 1048, 1050 n.1 (2d Cir. 1983). The same considerations that lead the court to dismiss this case also compel the conclusion that an appeal would not be taken in good faith.

It is CERTIFIED, pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 24(a), that any appeal in this matter by Plaintiff is not taken in good faith. Leave to proceed on appeal *in forma pauperis* is, therefore, DENIED. Accordingly, if Plaintiff files a notice of appeal, she must also pay the full \$455 appellate filing fee or file a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* and supporting

affidavit in the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals within thirty (30) days.<sup>1</sup>

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ **James D. Todd**  
JAMES D. TODD  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 3(a), any notice of appeal should be filed in this court. A motion to appeal *in forma pauperis* then should be filed directly in the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. Unless she is specifically instructed to do so, Plaintiff should not send to this court copies of documents intended for filing in the Sixth Circuit.